

Grupo	Nota	Projeto	Comments
1	14	ML	Report not well structured. use of pyspark. Analysis not well explained. Missing discussion for feature selection. Methodology of DS pipeline not solid. Conclusion should have been more elaborated
novo grupo 1	17	PA	Work well done. complete analysis, however insights could have been exposed better. DS methodology could have been more solid
2	16	PA	Work well done. complete analysis, however description of the findings and conclusions could be better
novo grupo 2	12	ML	Report not well structured. A lot of work but without justification of the choices. Cannot understand the soundness of the methodological approach. Missing results and conclusions
3	12	ML	Report not well structured. Methodologically not solid work. It doesn't justify properly the choice of the independent variables. poor conclusions
4	16	ML	Good exploratory analysis. Complete DS pipeline, but falls back in the lack of justification about the features in use. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.
A	16	ML	Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated
B	17	cloud	What is the qcow2 file format? You chose to show only steps that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.
C	15	cloud	I believe some of the problems you faced are associated with the use of the GCP to install your own cloud. Have you tried to use your own resources?
D	12	ML	Report not well structured. Good exploratory analysis, however the justification of feature selection is not well explained. Experiments (los prediction) are not complete. Conclusion should have been more elaborated
F	17	cloud	Bom trabalho, relatório bem feito e explicativo. Poderiam ter discutido e listado as principais dificuldades técnicas e a forma como as resolveram.
G	14	ML	metodologia não foi clara (e.g quais são as features usadas, distribuição das mesmas) Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não foi mostrada a capacidade de generalização do modelo. Como justifica-se um modelo para cada doença? é pratico?
H	12	ML	Report not well structured. EDA not very insightful. Los prediction pipeline not well executed. conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.
I	14	ML	Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions
L	18	cloud	Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.
N	16	ML	Report not well structured. Feature selection in ml pipeline not properly justified
O	13	PA	Report not well structured. benchmark not well explained. ml pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented
P	12	ML	Report not well structured. ml pipeline and features selection not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented
Q	13	ML	Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features ? Os items somministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura, toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg,min,max, porque? Relatório não bem estruturado
R	14	ML	Report not well structured. what is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short
S	12	ML	Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing
T	18	PA	Report well done.
U	13	ML	Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing
X	12	PA	Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results
Y	18	ML	Report well done.
W	14	ML	Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing